

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginsa 22313-1450 www.spile.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,812	09/26/2001	Jorg Gregor Schleicher	1104-032	1207
27820 WITHROW &	7590 04/29/2008 TERRANOVA, P.L.L.O	EXAMINER		
100 REGENC	Y FOREST DRIVE	JABR, FADEY S		
SUITE 160 CARY, NC 27	518		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/963,812	SCHLEICHER ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	FADEY S. JABR	3628		

		FADEY S. JABR	3628	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE RE	PLY FILED 03 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LLOWANCE.	
ap ap for	reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on ollication, applicant must timely file one of the following ollication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appr Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C iods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) 🔲	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
have beer under 37 set forth in may reduce	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 s of time may be obtained under 37 CPR 1.136(a). The date in filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex compared to the control of	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
filir	e Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp ig the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter tice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w MENTS.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. Th (a) (b) (c)	re proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); ter form for appeal by materially red	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying ti	
5. A	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). e amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 pilicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) ewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al h-allowable claim(s).	:		,
hor Th Cla Cla Cla	r purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) when ewe or amended claims would be rejected is provided in the claims. It is a status of the claims (s) is (or will be) as follows: im(s) allowed: im(s) objected to: im(s) rejected: 1-29. im(s) rejected: 1-29.		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
8. Th	/IT OR OTHER EVIDENCE e affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bucause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and so tearlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
en	e affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing ered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o owing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessan	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
	he affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio ST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. 🔲 T	he request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
13. 🛛 O	ote the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). ther: See Continuation Sheet.	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	l W HAYES/ isory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 13. Other: Examiner notes that periodically sending subscription based content taken in the broadest reasonable interpretation is a content being transferred to users. Ricci discloses transferring content to users (0040). Page 8 pf the provisional application 60/252334 discloses file owners or entities that share fulles to program the files to report royalties for advertising fees, report number of downloads vs actual opening of files, reports overall usage of a file's life span. Further, on page 8, Ricci discloses tracking and licensing of files. Also, on page 8, Ricci discloses track all end user destinations for determination of royalty payments. On Page 9, Ricci discloses The software trigger or digital acknowledgement trigger is sent to the servers which originate the file download or transfer, an advertising company is matched to the MPS on route to the user....The invention induced the software trigger, will send the commercials out based on the tag received to the end user simultaneously with the MP3 download (pp. 9-10). Therefore, the provisional application does qualify as prior art.

Further, Applicant argues that there is no suggesion to combine the references. Examiner asserts that Ricci and Ferguson et al. are both directed to charging and delivery of on-line content. Further, the combination of Ricci, Ferguson and Applicant anission of the prior art is valid. One of ordinary skill would be led to combine the references seeing as they all are directed to charging for content. Applicant also argues that Ricci does not teach or suggest monitoring the quantity of the content served. Examiner asserts that tracking which recipients have licensed which digital media is equivalent to monitoring the quantity of the content served. Examiner asserts that charging based on the number of uses is equivalent to charging based on the quantity of content served. In both cases an amount of content is delivered to user, and in both cases the user is charged based on the amount of content that is delivered to the user. As taken in its broadest reasonable interpretation, "quantity" is believed to be equivalent to the number of uses.